

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

July 11, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Stewart Straus called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Stewart Straus; Board Members Cecilia Antonio, Hal Beighley, Mimi Doukas, Monty Edberg, Ronald Nardoza and Jennifer Shipley.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, Associate Planner Scott Whyte, Associate Planner Liz Shotwell, Transportation Planner Don Gustafson and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Straus read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

OLD BUSINESS:

CONTINUANCES:

Chairman Straus opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

A. MONTAROSA TOWNHOMES, 56 UNITS ATTACHED

The proposed development site is generally located on the east side of SW 155th Avenue, south of SW Beard Road and north of SW Weir Road. The development site is addressed as 9530 SW 155th Avenue and can be specifically identified as Tax Lots 3500 and 3600 on Washington County Assessor's Tax Map 1S1-29DC. The affected parcels are zoned Urban Medium Density (R2) and together total approximately 3.36 acres in size.

1. BDR2002-0037 (Montarosa Townhomes, 56 Units Attached)

(Continued from June 27, 2002)

The applicant requests Type III Design Review approval to construct 56 townhome units housed within 11 separate buildings. Public streets are proposed as part of the proposed development plan providing connection to the existing terminus of SW Diamond Street, the abutting property to the south and future connection to SW 155th Avenue. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Section 40.10.15.3.C. of the Development Code.

2. TPP2002-0002 (Montarosa Townhome Subdivision Tree Preservation Plan)

(Continued from June 27, 2002)

Associated with the Montarosa Townhome project is a separate request for Tree Preservation Plan (TPP) approval. The proposed application will affect two existing groves of trees identified by the City's Tree Inventory as Significant Groves G-80 and G-82. The proposed development plan would remove trees considered part of groves G-80 and G-82 while retaining others. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria thereof, listed in Section 40.75.15.1.C.3 of the Development Code.

Associate Planner Scott Whyte presented the two separate Staff Reports related to this proposal, specifically for approval of a Design Review and a Tree Preservation Plan for a 56-unit town home development. Observing that two separate projects are associated with this proposal, he pointed out that the Planning Commission had approved three applications (Subdivision, Flexible Setback and Tree Preservation Plan), for the Montarosa Single-Family Subdivision at their meeting last night, noting that the applicant is now referring to the single-family proposal as the Polomar Single-Family Subdivision, and that some very minor modifications had been made to the request. He pointed out that while these applications involve two separate projects, some of the elements of the applicant's materials, such as the Traffic Study and Drainage Analysis, address both projects. He discussed the proposed improvements and access issues, noting that the Planning Director previously approved an associated request for a Fee Ownership Subdivision on this townhome site. He mentioned the necessity of approving the Tree Preservation Plan to allow for the development of the subdivision, noting that the applicant's arborist, Walter Knapp, submitted the Arborist's Report, dated July 1, 2002. He pointed out that certain trees have been proposed for removal due to hazardous conditions and for construction purposes, adding that staff has found the plan to meet applicable criteria for approval. He discussed verbal comments that had been received from some of the residents of Camden Crossing, and entered into the record a letter from Luanne Clark, dated July 1, 2002, adding that she has expressed concern with the potential appearance of the three-story units proposed by the developer and is also a resident of Camden Crossing. Concluding, he submitted the color and material board, recommended approval of both applications with certain Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to questions.

Ms. Doukas questioned whether the colors on the units would alternate for each single-family residence, specifically that an entire bay of townhomes would not have the same color scheme.

Mr. Whyte referred Ms. Doukas' question with regard to the color schemes to the applicant.

APPLICANT:

DOUG MULL, representing *Dolphin Development*, briefly described his credentials, observing that the applicant had basically pioneered the concept of row houses in the suburbs with the Molly Park Project. He discussed the proposal and described the four proposed front elevations and five color combinations, shutters and shingle designs. Emphasizing that the applicant creates as much individuality as possible among the different units, he pointed out that there has been a great deal of acceptance among the market because these homes are both attractive and relatively affordable. Emphasizing that there is an access to SW 155th Avenue through the Polomar site, he pointed out that this would also provide the construction access for both projects.

MIKE MILLER, representing *MGH Associates*, discussed the four major components involved in this proposal and any land development, specifically the expertise, the land, the jurisdictional regulations and the market. Observing that the basic issues on this site are the slope and the trees, he emphasized that every attempt had been made to preserve as many trees as possible. Expressing appreciation to staff for their assistance in refining the plan to preserve even more trees, he mentioned that there is also an issue with views, adding that the applicant has gone to great lengths to illustrate sections and elevations as they relate to the project to the north. He pointed out that the applicant had provided a great deal of traffic calming, adding that jurisdictionally, this proposal involves an R-2 site, which provides for a minimum density of 34 units and a maximum density of 73 units, adding that the proposed 56 units is approximately in the middle of that range. He mentioned that all setback requirements have been satisfied, he explained that clustering had enabled the applicant to set aside tracts in order to preserve some of the trees on the project. He stated that all engineering and Facilities Review standards have been met, expressing his opinion that staff is comfortable with the applicant's efforts. He discussed the scope of the project as it relates to Camden Crossing, including proposed landscaping and fencing. Concluding, he requested approval of both applications, adding that the applicant's entire team of experts, including the Civil Engineer and the Arborist, is available to respond to questions.

Ms. Doukas questioned whether an exhibit has been prepared illustrating the appearance of the trees along the north boundary of the site following approximately five years of maturity.

Mr. Miller advised Ms. Doukas that the exhibit that has been provided illustrates the trees closer to their full maturity, approximately ten years, emphasizing that these trees would be six to eight feet in height at the time of planting.

Ms. Shipley requested clarification of whether the existing grove of trees would be visible across the site.

Observing that this should have been shown in the illustrations, Mr. Miller informed Ms. Shipley that these trees are approximately 60 to 70 feet in height and would be visible throughout the entire site.

On question, Mr. Mull advised Ms. Antonio that Camden Crossing is the same width as Montarosa.

Mr. Miller expressed his opinion that because the building would block the view, it would be difficult to view the site from Camden Crossing.

Chairman Straus questioned whether the applicant has made any effort to break up the continuity of the roofs or walls that face the neighbors to the north of the proposed development.

Mr. Mull informed Chairman Straus that each home in a building features a different color scheme as well as additional features to the extent the site allows.

Chairman Straus suggested other features, such as bay windows, wind walls, decks or dormers on the roofs, adding that there is an entire series of features that could be introduced that would serve this purpose.

Ms. Doukas expressed her opinion that while the applicant has addressed this issue with the different color schemes for the buildings, it might be necessary to make more specific revisions with regard to the roofline.

Mr. Miller explained that the addition of extra features such as dormers would make these homes unaffordable for a large portion of the population, emphasizing that this is an apartment-zoned site that actually allows for significantly greater density.

Ms. Doukas expressed her appreciation of the efforts made by the applicant and observed that her concerns with specific issues override that concern, emphasizing that the neighbors to the north would be visually impacted by the mass of the building.

Mr. Miller suggested the possibility of adding some conditioning for some gables to break up the roofline at the rear of the buildings.

Referring to the landscaping plan, Ms. Shipley noted that a hatch pattern is shown under the existing trees and questioned whether groundcover has been proposed for this area.

Mr. Miller advised Ms. Shipley that this applicant's intent is to plant a groundcover, as opposed to a lawn, in this area.

Ms. Shipley expressed concern with irrigation.

Mr. Miller explained that all of the proposed homes would have front-yard irrigation, as well as surrounding the properties, with the exception of enclosed back yards, which would require approval of the Homeowner's Association. Observing that this provides the homeowners with the opportunity to personalize their property, he pointed out that this would also allow for the installation of irrigation systems in these enclosed back yards. He mentioned that this particular plan has been very popular, emphasizing that it has actually outsold the other available plans at a ratio of five to one. He explained that the homeowner's must landscape their back yards within six months of occupancy, adding that the Board must approve plans and that there is an extensive amount of criteria. Pointing out that good fences and good control make for good neighbors, he emphasized that appropriate enforcement mechanisms have been developed.

Ms. Shipley advised Mr. Miller that her concern basically involves attempting to incorporate new plantings and irrigation without interfering with the root systems of the existing trees, as well as the potential for compromising the health of these trees by creating a water regime to which they are unaccustomed.

Mr. Miller expressed his opinion that this has been addressed through putting groundcover, rather than lawn, in this area, adding that this minimizes the potential for over watering the native trees.

Referring to the conditioned dormers, Mr. Mull suggested that the applicant would prefer to have the option of including these dormers on additional buildings, if possible, in order to provide some consistency throughout the project.

Observing that she would only condition these dormers on the north elevation, Ms. Doukas advised Mr. Mull that it would be at the discretion of the applicant to provide additional dormers.

Mr. Mull pointed out that he would prefer that the condition provide some language that would allow for additional dormers on the other buildings, emphasizing that he would like to avoid the possibility of being required to submit an application for a Type 1 Design Review, if possible.

Chairman Straus suggested that the condition stipulate the building on the north elevation and any other buildings selected by the applicant.

Ms. Doukas explained that she would recommend that dormers would be required on the rear elevations of Unit Nos. 12, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25 and 28, and could be added to any other units, at the discretion of the applicant, adding that the applicant would also have the option of providing different types of dormers.

Chairman Straus expressed concern with the bareness of the end walls of the buildings, observing that these walls are basically blank, with the exception of several small windows. Observing that several options are available, he suggested that other features should be added in order to embellish the appearance of these walls.

Mr. Miller stated that the project includes two different types of end units, adding that he is sensitive to Chairman Straus' concern, suggesting the possibility of providing a bay window.

Chairman Straus questioned the interior functions adjacent to those end walls.

Mr. Miller informed Chairman Straus that the dining areas of the homes are adjacent to the end walls, observing that these could easily be revised to pop-out bay windows.

Chairman Straus expressed his opinion that providing pop-out bay windows in the dining areas of these end units would be appropriate and address his concern.

Ms. Doukas suggested that the pop-out bay windows should be provided in the dining areas of Unit Nos. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 42, 49 and 50.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

KYLE WAGONER expressed concern with the height of the south wall and the appearance of the 19 units, adding that this would create what he referred to as a monolith on that ridge. Observing that the elevations are slightly deceiving, he submitted as exhibits some photographs illustrating the elevations in this area.

KAREN LINDSAY expressed concern with the possibility that the massive size of the buildings would prevent sunlight from reaching her own property, observing that while her current view is the top of a garage unit, the proposal would add two stories over that garage unit.

Mr. Nardozza questioned the proximity of the garage to the property line.

Ms. Lindsay advised Mr. Nardozza that while she has never actually been on the other side of the fence, the property owner stores his RV next to the fence, adding that the distance is basically the width of an RV.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL:

Mr. Miller requested and reviewed the photographs submitted by Mr. Wagoner, observing that these photographs illustrate the existing condition of Camden Crossing. He stated that what has been shown by the applicant is actually a typical wall, which is higher than four feet, in some cases, adding that the applicant has no control over this issue. Observing that the applicant had provided a great deal of mitigation to address this issue, he pointed out that there had been no response at the two neighborhood meetings that had been scheduled.

At the request of Chairman Straus, Mr. Miller explained that two different types of site conditions exist, adding that the top condition is where the wall is higher and the site line is steeper. He pointed out that the lower condition, where the building is 2½ stories, the building has been placed back even further.

Chairman Straus pointed out that rather than presenting a three-story structure to the neighbors, the first story is essentially buried in the ground opposite the property line, adding that any additional height has been adequately mitigated.

Mr. Whyte responded to some of the issues that had been raised, observing that proposed Condition of Approval No. 10 requires an irrigation system within the transitional areas of the three tracts (Tracts A, B and H), adding that ornamental plants and shrubs for visual screening purposes are indicated as well.

Senior Planner John Osterberg emphasized that it is necessary to make certain that any motion for approval contains appropriate language with regard to both the dormers that are required and those to be allowed at the discretion of the applicant.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Ms. Doukas questioned whether more specificity with regard to the irrigation for the tracts should be provided.

Referring to Condition of Approval No. 10, Ms. Shipley requested further clarification of what is meant by the transitional areas.

Mr. Whyte explained that the transitional areas are intended to indicate the perimeters of Tracts A, B and H, specifically where the ornamental shrubs are identified in the plant legend. He mentioned that ornamental shrubs and native plantings such as vine maple have been proposed, adding that the intent of this Condition of Approval would be to leave the natural areas and existing trees alone.

Ms. Shipley expressed concern with the new plantings proposed within the existing trees, emphasizing the necessity of making certain that these plants are watered adequately until they are established.

Mr. Whyte advised Ms. Shipley that this Condition of Approval does not address these trees proposed within the interior portions of those tracts, adding that the Board might want to modify this condition to provide for some type of irrigation line in this area.

Ms. Doukas expressed her opinion that there should be some flexibility with regard to this issue.

Ms. Shipley reiterated that there should be some provision to ensure that these plantings would be watered adequately through the period of establishment, adding that although this would not necessarily require the installation of an irrigation system, there should be regular watering throughout the dry season.

Chairman Straus expressed concern with relying on an individual to drag a hose through the woods to provide water to these trees, and suggested that some type of sprinkler system should be considered.

Ms. Doukas **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2002-0037 – Montarosa Townhomes/56 Units Attached Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated July 3, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 17, modifying Condition of Approval No. 10, as follows:

10. The installation of an approved irrigation system shall be required to ensure the longevity of all landscaping. Irrigation system shall be required within the transitional areas of Tracts A, B and H where ornamental shrubs and plants for visual screening purposes are shown on the approved landscape plan, and temporary irrigation for new plantings within the existing grove. Further, landscaping shall be maintained by weeding, pruning, and replacement as necessary.

And adding additional Conditions of Approval, as follows:

18. Dormers shall be added to the rear elevations of Unit Nos. 12, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25 and 28, and additional dormers shall be permitted throughout the rest of the development for consistency.
19. Bay windows shall be provided on all building side elevations that face public areas, specifically Unit Nos. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 42, 49 and 50.
20. The rear elevations along the north project boundary shall be limited to 2 to 2½ stories, as presented in the elevations shown in the July 11, 2002 Public Hearing.

Ms. Doukas complimented the applicants on their efforts to preserve the trees on this difficult site.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** by the following vote:

AYES: Antonio, Doukas, Nardozza, Shipley and Straus.
NAYS: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Beighley.

Ms. Doukas **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of TPP 2002-0002 – Montarosa Townhomes Subdivision Tree Preservation Plan, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated July 3, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 4.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** by the following vote:

AYES: Antonio, Doukas, Nardozza, Shipley and Straus.
NAYS: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Beighley.

8:12 p.m. – Mr. Whyte and Mr. Gustafson left.

8:12 p.m. to 8:26 p.m. -- break

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. BDR2002-0002 - CEDAR HILLS CROSSING REDEVELOPMENT

The applicant requests Type III Design Review approval for the redevelopment of Beaverton Mall (to be renamed Cedar Hills Crossing). Redevelopment of the site is proposed to include an addition and façade changes to the existing structure, the addition of new retail pads within the existing parking lot, a street connection extending SW Hall Boulevard to SW Hocken Avenue along the western property line of the subject site, and related modifications. In addition, the applicant requests a modification to the loading berth standard for the existing GI Joe's and for a proposed retail pad. The Board of Design Review will review the overall design of this request including buildings, landscaping, street and parking lot layout, and lighting design. In taking action on the proposed development, the Board shall base its decision on the approval criteria listed in Section 40.10.15.3.C. The subject site is generally located on the west side of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, south of SW Jenkins Road, north of SW Dawson Way. The

development proposal is located at 3205 SW Cedar Hills Boulevard; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-09, Tax Lot 00200; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-09DB, Tax Lot's 200 and 300; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-09AC, Tax Lot's 15201 and 15300. The affected parcel is zoned Community Service (CS) and is approximately 36 acres in size.

Observing that her firm had been involved in this application from a civil engineering standpoint, Ms. Doukas recused herself from participating in this decision and left at 8:27 p.m.

Associate Planner Liz Shotwell presented the Staff Report and described the proposal for the redevelopment of the Beaverton Mall as Cedar Hills Crossing, including façade modifications and building additions to the primary structure, as well as the addition of two new building pads, to be located along SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and the redesign of an existing retail facility located at the corner of SW Jenkins Road and SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. Observing that the applicant is also proposing the demolition of an existing building located on the southern portion of the property, and drive aisle and parking modifications to the parcels west of the existing mall, which were recently annexed from Washington County. She mentioned that the applicant is also proposing parking, landscaping and drive aisle modifications throughout the site in order to accommodate the redevelopment as well as to enhance the safety and efficiency of the existing vehicular and pedestrian circulation. She briefly discussed a private drive aisle that has been proposed, observing that this facility would be aligned directly opposite of SW Hall Boulevard, and connect from SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, extend through the site and provide a connection to SW Hocken Street. Noting that this drive aisle would be private, she pointed out that public access would be allowed as well. She revised paragraph 3 of page 14, as follows: "...The applicant's proposal of a total vehicular parking space count of ~~2,011~~ 1,994 is..." Concluding, she entered the materials board into the record, recommended approval of the application, subject to certain Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to questions.

Observing that this proposal includes a great many changes, Chairman Straus questioned whether the applicant has indicated that this work would occur in phases.

Ms. Shotwell advised Chairman Straus that while the applicant is not proposing any phasing with regard to this proposal, Condition of Approval C.B in the Facilities Review Report provides that development permits can be obtained in two phases.

APPLICANT:

MARK PERNICONI, representing the *C. E. John Company*, observed that one of their entities, *Center Development Oregon, Ltd.*, is the original developer and

still owns the mall. He introduced Gary Rommel, who is the principal architect, observing that he would be providing the majority of the presentation this evening.

GARY ROMMEL introduced the site plan and described several small aspects of the proposal, emphasizing that there is far too much occurring to allow for specific details in this short presentation. Observing that several small pieces that are occurring from a site planning standpoint that have been addressed through the redevelopment of the project, he noted that probably the most important piece from the standpoint of traffic and pedestrian flow in and out of site is the development of SW Hall Boulevard, which will be a private road. He discussed improvements that would be made, including highlighting the crosswalks and elevating the asphalt with concrete walks including a grid and demarcation, adding that a group of seven or eight parking stalls that back out into the aisle would be eliminated in order to provide for connectivity throughout the site. Observing that a 3,000 square foot addition would replace the existing boatyard at *G.I. Joe's*, he pointed out that this space is needed for the relocation of businesses during the development of the property. Noting that not a great deal of redevelopment would occur at the *Elmer's Restaurant* and *Washington Mutual Bank*, he pointed out that some work, including some landscaping, would occur in the vehicular drive in front of the mall in order to soften the curve and make it more contiguous. He discussed new entries into the mall itself, observing that one of the plaza areas would be redeveloped in order to provide a pedestrian-friendly area. Observing that the applicant had found it necessary to address pedestrian circulation throughout the site, he noted that a sidewalk would be added in order to provide a strong north/south access for pedestrians around the entire building. Noting that new store fronts, which he referred to as a "Hollywood" front, would be created on the back of the building, he mentioned that the back side of *G.I. Joe's* had presented more of a challenge due to the nature of the existing service area. He noted that a small addition of approximately 200 square feet would be added to the existing enclosed loading dock, adding that some of the loading docks would be eliminated to provide for landscaping and parking. Emphasizing that this landscaping would include mature plantings, he explained that this would serve as a foil for the back of the building. He stated that he had covered the basic concept, pointing that there are issues with the floodplain and options for creating a larger cross section in the creek. Noting that there is a proposal for a new bridge, he emphasized that the funding for this bridge is not available at this point. Concluding, he explained that new surface parking would be created, adding that there are no plans at this time to add another building in the near future.

Chairman Straus requested clarification of whether the portion of the development that would occur within the jurisdiction of Washington County is consistent with what is proposed within the City of Beaverton's jurisdiction.

Mr. Rommel commented that the applicant is basically attempting to achieve a fresh new appearance, using a variety of materials with different textures and scales, and offered to respond to questions.

Ms. Antonio referred to the intersection where SW Hall Boulevard crosses SW Cedar Hills and enters the development, expressing her opinion that this area currently feels like a driveway, requesting clarification of whether this would be developed as more of an actual street.

Mr. Rommel advised Ms. Antonio that this issue had been considered with the concept of adding the sidewalk, observing that along with the proposed landscaping, the hard edges would be defined. He pointed out that traffic control elements would be present, including stop signs, queuing lanes, stop bars, and pedestrian crosswalks. Noting that *Ross* currently feels like an isolated building, the developer would be adding landscaping and improvements to the façade in an attempt to soften that up.

Ms. Antonio questioned whether the applicant is concerned with the potential of vehicles cutting back and forth between SW Hocken Street and SW Cedar Hills Boulevard.

Mr. Rommel informed Ms. Antonio that while the applicant is aware that this would occur to some extent, it is hoped that the majority of these vehicles will involve customers.

Mr. Nardoza referred to the huge concrete wall on the north side of the property.

Mr. Rommel stated that while no modifications would be made, this wall would be painted, and that the facade of *Winco* would be improved to have more of a market appearance. He pointed out that although this is a frustrating situation, the applicant has been encouraged to attempt to cut costs with regard to the façade of the building, adding that he would have preferred to make more improvements. He mentioned that the changes to the colors and materials in the entries would serve to freshen up and provide a better scale to the project.

Mr. Perniconi emphasized that while there are three national retailers, this mall serves the local community and is not considered a regional mall, adding that there would be more of a local flavor to the food court.

Mr. Rommel stated that a second floor level would include conference rooms and mall offices, adding that a portion of this second floor would be stripped to provide a 2 to 2½ story volume, with an identifiable element that hangs from the ceiling, similar in character to the trellis work that would be developed outside of the building. He provided a handout, emphasizing that while this is a generally graphic representation of what it could be, this does not necessarily provide the final format.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

No member of the public provided testimony with regard to this application.

Staff had no further comments with regard to this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Nardozza **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2002-0002 – Cedar Hills Crossing Redevelopment Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated July 3, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 24.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** by the following vote:

AYES:	Antonio, Nardozza, Shipley and Straus.
NAYS:	None.
ABSTAIN:	None.
ABSENT:	Beighley and Doukas.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of June 13, 2002, as written, were submitted. Chairman Straus asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Nardozza **MOVED** and Ms. Antonio **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Ms. Shipley, who abstained from voting on this issue.

The minutes of June 27, 2002, as written, were submitted. Observing that Vice-Chairman Beighley had been the only member of the Board of Design Review in attendance at this meeting that had been for continuation purposes only, Mr. Nardozza **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called, and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.